

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of November 20, 2002. Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims presently on file are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

THE CLAIMS

REJECTION UNDER 325 USC 103

Claims 1 - 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang et al. in view of Pirololi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that the claims on file are not obvious in view of the cited references and are patentable thereover. In support of this position, Applicant submits the following arguments:

A. Legal Standards for Obviousness

The following are court opinions set the general standards in support of Applicant's position of non obviousness, with emphasis added for added clarity:

- **"Obviousness cannot be established** by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, **absent some teaching or suggestion** supporting the combination." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d at 1075, 5 USPQ2d at 1598 (citing *ACS Hosp. Sys. v. Montefiore Hosp.*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). **What a reference teaches** and whether it teaches toward or **away from the claimed invention** are questions of fact. See *Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp.*, 724 F.2d 951, 960-61, 220 USPQ 592, 599-600 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 835, 83 L. Ed. 2d 69, 105 S. Ct. 127 (1984). "
- "When a rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be **some teaching, suggestion, or motivation** to combine the references. See *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 688, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." **Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying** the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention **where there is some teaching, suggestion, or**

motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2143.01; In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000); In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

- “With respect to core factual findings in a determination of patentability, however, the **Board cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own understanding or experience** -- or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense. **Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record** in support of these findings.” See In re Zurko, 258 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2001).
- “We have noted that **evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine** may flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved, see Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc., 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1630 (Fed. Cir. 1996), Para-Ordinance Mfg. v. SGS Imports Intern., Inc., 73 F.3d 1085, 1088, 37 USPQ2d 1237, 1240 (Fed. Cir. 1995), although “the suggestion more often comes from the teachings of the pertinent references,” Rouffet, 149 F.3d at 1355, 47 USPQ2d at 1456. The range of sources available, however, does not diminish the requirement for actual evidence. That is, **the showing must be clear and particular**. See, e.g., C.R. Bard, 157 F.3d at 1352, 48 USPQ2d at 1232. **Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not “evidence.”** E.g., McElmurry v. Arkansas Power & Light Co., 995 F.2d 1576, 1578, 27 USPQ2d 1129, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (“Mere denials and conclusory statements, however, are not sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact.”); In re Sichert, 566 F.2d 1154, 1164, 196 USPQ 209, 217 (CCPA 1977).” See In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999).
- “To prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, **this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the references** that create the case of obviousness. In other words, **the examiner must show reasons** that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references **for combination in the manner claimed**.” See In re Rouffet, 149, F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
- MPEP 2143.01-“The Prior Art Must Suggest The Desirability Of The Claimed Invention. There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art.” In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998) **(The combination of the references taught every element of the claimed invention, however without a**

motivation to combine, a rejection based on a prima facie case of obvious was held improper.). The level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references. *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

- The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious **unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.** In *re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Although a prior art device "may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, **there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference** to do so." 916 F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432.). See also In *re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (flexible landscape edging device which is conformable to a ground surface of varying slope not suggested by combination of prior art references).
- If the **proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory** for its intended purpose, **then there is no suggestion or motivation** to make the proposed modification. In *re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)

B. Brief Summary of the Present Invention

Prior to presenting substantive arguments in favor of the allowability of the claims on file, it might be desirable to summarize the present invention.

As indicated by the title, the present invention relates to a system and method for integrating on-line user ratings of businesses with search engines," and addresses the problem facing current search engines that "use a variety of criteria to order matches to the user query and to rank the search results with higher quality pages listed at the top of the search list. Assessing quality involves both accurately matching the user query and identifying a useful, current web page. For instance, search engines may order the matches based on what is referred to herein as "static criteria". Exemplary static criteria are the highest popularity, most recently updated, most visited, most queried, or most interconnected. It is common for users to limit the review of their search to only the first few matches of the search list." (Reference is made to page 2, line 17 through page 3, line 4 of the specification.)

The present invention also aims at providing an "adequate mechanism by which searches of business sites can be ordered based upon interactive criteria about the businesses themselves, correlating higher quality search matches to higher business satisfaction ratings. For example, popularity, is a commonly used static criterion which is determined by the number of visits or queries of business sites, and which may depend on advertising, strategic business alliances, or creative naming of a site, and is therefore independent of customers satisfaction with the ranked businesses. Therefore, there is still an unsatisfied need for a system and method that integrate user provided interactive criteria, such as customers and on-line users' satisfaction, with search engine results." Reference is made to page 3, lines 12-20 of the specification. Exemplary on-line sources include questionnaires and other on-line surveys obtained through other web based rating services. The business ratings assess the quality of the businesses in terms of "interactive" criteria such as customer satisfaction, professionalism, and cost and ease of use of products or services. (Reference is made to page 4, lines 6-9 of the specification.)

The business rating system integrates the ratings with the search results, and ranks and presents the integrated search results to the user based on such ratings. In this manner, the user of a search engine receives feedback from other users and/or customers about businesses of interest. (Reference is made to page 4, lines 12-14 of the specification). In a preferred embodiment, the users complete and submit on-line surveys that are integrated with the search engine results. The information provided by the users is recorded and evaluated for the purpose of ranking the businesses. The ratings are made available to future users of the search engines. In another embodiment, in addition to a numerical rating system, the current on-line users may include descriptive annotations regarding customer satisfaction to be read by future users. In this manner, qualitative as well as quantitative feedback may be provided by the current users and examined by future users. (Reference is made to page 5, lines 5-12 of the specification.)

In use, the on-line ranking system receives users' on-line surveys or feedback, and generates ranking data for storage in the on-line ranking repository. The user profile history enables the user to update or override the rating previously provided by this user but not the ratings provided by other users. (Reference is made to page 10, lines 12-14 of the specification). The cumulative rating computation can be weighted based upon other ratings a particular user may have provided. Reference is made to page 15, lines 2-3 of the specification).

C. Lang et al. Patent

The office action rejects claims 1, 9, and 17 in light of the Lang et al. patent ("Lang"), stating that "Lang discloses an on-line ranking system for receiving any of users' on-line surveys or feedback about businesses, (col. 5, lines 51 - col. 6, lines 4, col. 24, lines 63 - col. 25, lines 5, and col. 7, lines 47-62); the on-line ranking system generating rating data from the any of the users' on-line surveys or feedback, (col. 5, lines 51 - col. 6, lines 4, col. 24, lines 63 - col. 25, lines 5, and col. 7, lines 47-62); wherein the on-line ranking system indexes the rating data, (col. 24, lines 63-col. 25, lines 5 and col. 22, lines 36-64); an on-line ranking repository for storing the rating data indexed by the on-line ranking system, (col. 1, lines 65-col. 2, lines 3 and col. 22, lines 36-64); and a result sorter for sorting query results generating by the search engine, based on the rating data from the on-line ranking repository, and for generating ranked matches, (col. 24, lines 49 - col. 25, lines 5 and col. 23, lines 33-38)."

The office action further makes the following very important statement admitting the absence of a crucial aspect of the present invention from Lang: "Lang does not explicitly disclose, "Wherein the rating data correlates higher quality search matches to higher business satisfaction rating." "

In order to find a substitute for this missing element, the Examiner resorted to another reference, Pirolli et al. ("Pirolli"), stating: "However, Pirolli shows wherein the rating data correlates higher quality search matches to higher business satisfaction rating, (cal. 3, lines 31-cal. 4, lines 60 and col. 2, lines 65-68).

Therefore, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lang with the teaching of Pirolli, so the user can rely on the ranking system of the search results to determine which documents or businesses should be view first."

D. Pirolli et al. Patent

Pirolli generally describes a system and method for ranking the results of a search on a collection of linked documents. The system utilizes various information relating to the collection of linked documents, including the topology, content and historical usage of the linked collections of documents. The ranking is based on historical patterns and information about the current context of interest (e.g. what the user or group seems to be currently interested in doing). A spreading activation technique is used to identify the frequency of activation of the documents in the search results. Spreading activation techniques are based on representations of Web pages as nodes in graph networks representing usage, content, and hypertext relations among Web pages. After performing the spreading activation based on an initial set defined by the search results, each document from the results may be ranked based on their level of activation.

In summary, Lang describes a search engine system that is provided for a portal site on the internet. The search engine system employs a regular search engine to make one-shot or demand searches for information entities that provide at least threshold matches to user queries. The search engine system employs a collaborative/content-based filter to make continuing searches for information entities which match existing wire queries and are ranked and stored over time in user-

accessible, system wires corresponding to the respective queries. A user feedback system provides collaborative feedback data for integration with content profile data in the operation of the collaborative/content-based filter. A query processor determines whether a demand search or a wire search is made for an input query.

E. Independent Claims 1, 9, and 17 in Light of Lang

Applicant will now present arguments in support of the allowance of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and the claims dependent thereon, over Lang and Pirolli. Claim 1, as a representative claim, recites the following elements that are not described in Lang:

“

“1. A system for use with a search engine to rank search results, comprising:
an on-line ranking system for receiving any of users' on-line surveys or feedback about businesses;

the on-line ranking system generating rating data from the any of the users' on-line surveys or feedback;

wherein the rating data correlates higher quality search matches to higher business satisfaction ratings; and

wherein the on-line ranking system **indexes the rating data;**
an on-line ranking repository for **storing the rating data** indexed by the on-line ranking system; and

a result sorter for **sorting query results** generated by the search engine, **based on the rating data** from the on-line ranking repository, and for generating ranked matches.” (Emphasis added).

E. 1. First Missing Element

Applicant agrees with the examiner that **Lang does not generate rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating.**

Applicant submits that this **is an essential element/limitation** of the invention as recited in claims 1, 9, and 17.

E. 2. Second Missing Element

The Examiner states that Lang discloses the following element: “wherein the on-line ranking system indexes the rating data, (col. 24, lines 63-col. 25, lines 5 and col. 22, lines 36-64).” Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection ground and submits that Examiner’s statement is inconsistent with the assertion that the **rating data of Lang does not correlate higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating**. (Refer to Section E.1. First Missing Element).

“Rating data” is clearly defined in claims 1, 9, and 17, as rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating, and thus the second element that is missing from Lang impliedly reads as follows: “wherein the on-line ranking system indexes the rating data that **correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating**.”

If, as stated by the Examiner the rating data of Lang does not correlate higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating, then, contrary to the Examiner’s rejection ground, **the on-line ranking system of Lang cannot index rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating**.

E. 3. Third Missing Element

The Examiner states that Lang discloses the following element: “an on-line ranking repository for storing the rating data indexed by the on-line ranking system, (col. 1, lines 65-col. 2, lines 3 and cal. 22, lines 36-64).” Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection ground and submits that Examiner’s statement is inconsistent with the

assertion that the **rating data of Lang does not correlate higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating**. (Refer to Section E.1. First Missing Element).

Applicant reiterates that “rating data” is clearly defined in claims 1, 9, and 17, as rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating, and thus the third element that is missing from Lang impliedly reads as follows: “an on-line ranking repository for **storing the rating data** that **correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating** and that are **indexed** by the on-line ranking system.”

If, as stated by the Examiner the rating data of Lang does not correlate higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating, then, contrary to the Examiner’s rejection ground, the on-line ranking repository of Lang cannot **store the indexed rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating**.

E. 4. Fourth Missing Element

The Examiner states that Lang discloses the following element: “a result sorter [for] sorting query results generating by the search engine, based on the rating data from the on-line ranking repository, and for generating ranked matches, (col. 24, lines 49-col. 25, lines 5 and col. 23, lines 33-38).” Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection ground and submits that Examiner’s statement is inconsistent with the assertion that the **rating data of Lang does not correlate higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating**. (Refer to Section E.1. First Missing Element).

Applicant reiterates again (due to the importance of this point) that “rating data” is clearly defined in claims 1, 9, and 17, as rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating, and thus the fourth element that is missing from Lang impliedly reads as follows: “a result sorter for **sorting query**

results generated by the search engine, based on the rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating from the on-line ranking repository, and for generating ranked matches.”

If, as stated by the Examiner the rating data of Lang does not correlate higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating, then, contrary to the Examiner's rejection ground, the on-line ranking repository of Lang cannot store the indexed rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating.

To conclude, independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are allowable over Lang, and thus the claims dependent thereon are also allowable, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

F. Independent Claims 1, 9, and 17 in Light of Lang and Pirolli

F.1. Pirolli does not disclose the rating data of the present invention

The Examiner cites Pirolli as disclosing “wherein the rating data correlates higher quality search matches to higher business satisfaction rating, (col. 3, lines 31 - col. 4, lines 60 and col. 2, lines 65-68).” Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection ground, and reproduces herein, the text that has been cited by the Examiner, to substantiate the assertion that the text cited by the Examiner does not disclose such an important claim element. In the following excerpts, the texts referencing the ranking process are underlined:

“A system for ranking the results of a search for documents from a collection of linked documents is disclosed. The ranking is based on historical patterns and information about a current context of interest of a user or group.”

The currently preferred embodiment of the present invention is implemented for ranking the resulting set of documents obtained through a search of a collection of

linked documents residing on the portion of the Internet known as the World Wide Web (hereinafter the Web). However, it should be noted that the present invention is not limited to use on the Web and may be utilized in any system which provides access to linked entities, including documents, images, videos, audio, etc. Further, in this description, the term Web page is an instance of a linked document and the two terms may be used interchangeably.

It has been observed that a collection of Web pages has a topology that is defined by links contained in the individual Web pages. Links are an indicator on a Web page which refers to another Web page and which can typically be retrieved in a point and click fashion. The link will specify the address, i.e. Uniform Resource Locator or URL, of the other Web page. On the Web the URL is commonly specified using the HyperText Transport Protocol (HTTP).

The present invention is motivated by the need to assist users in finding information on the World Wide Web. As the amount of information accessible on the Web continues to grow, much of it becomes out dated and redundant. It would be useful to be able to sort and rank search results based on measurements other than the similarity of web pages to the query or by the classifications provided. In particular, it has been determined through observation that it would be useful to order the presentation of search results using a historical and context based perspective.

For example, a user may want a ranking based on the most recently accessed documents. This would assist the searcher in determining if the information is "stale". This would be desirable if the information being sought has a limited "useful life", e.g. legal information or other information which may frequently change.

The ranking of the Search Result provides valuable information to the user. The user may rely on the ranking of the search results to determine which documents should be viewed first. Or the user may use the ranking to exclude documents from being viewed.

One aspect of the present invention provides a way in which search results may be ordered, other than by category or by similarity to the user's text query. Also it should be noted that the present invention can be used in combination with techniques for ordering search results based on text similarity with the user query.

Another use of the present invention may be to remove infrequently used documents from a document collection. For example, suppose it is determined that a document collection contains too many documents relating to a particular subject. This can be done by performing a search on the subject and determining that the number of documents in the search results exceeds some threshold. Anyway, the present invention can then be used to order the search results based on frequency

of access. The least frequently accessed documents may then be removed from the document collection.

Overview of the Search Result Ranking Technique of the Currently Preferred Embodiment

The flowchart of FIG. 1 describes the general steps for performing the steps of the present invention wherein the user desires that the search result be ordered to take into account the historical usage of the document collection and a user or group context. It should be noted that the steps need not necessarily be carried out in the order described. For example, the initial data gathering and matrix generation steps could be performed independently and updated on a periodic basis. The generated matrices could be applied to any search on the document collection. It should also be noted that different matrices representing different attributes of the document collection, may be used. The matrices used would depend on the different characteristics desired for the ordering. Co-pending application Ser. No. 08/831,807 describes how different matrices can be used to obtain different characteristics.

In any event, first, empirical data relating to the document collection is gathered, step 101. The empirical data may typically reside on usage records for the particular document collection (e.g. derived from Web Site usage records), or may be generated through analysis of the documents in the document collection (e.g. determining content similarity or link topology).

Next, a matrix of page to page transitions S is initialized, step 102. This is typically a usage-based matrix. The entries in the matrix indicate the proportion of users viewing a page that go from a particular page to another linked page.

Next, a probability function or vector is initialized embodying the law of surfing, step 103. The law of surfing is based on observations of raw data concerning usage of a document collection. The law of surfing provides an indication of the proportion of people who have produced $L-1$ clicks who then make another L th click (i.e., the people who have not left after $L-1$ clicks)." Column 3, line 31 - column 4, line 60.

"and ranking said search results based on said ranking information, said ranking based on the level of activation achieved." Column 2, lines 65 - 68.

F.2. Lang cannot be combined with Pirolli to form a proper rejection ground

The Examiner further adds: "Therefore, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lang with the teaching of Pirolli, so the user can rely on the ranking system of the search results to determine which documents or businesses should be [viewed] first."

Applicant submits that it is axiomatic that simply because a reference (i.e., Lang) can be modified (and it is not clear how Lang could in fact be modified to use rating data that correlates higher quality matches to higher business satisfaction rating since Pirolli does not disclose this element), it is insufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness unless the prior art motivates the modification. Indeed, actual evidence of this is required, and broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not evidence. Reference is made to the extensive legal authorities cited earlier in support of this traversal position.

With the foregoing legal authorities in mind, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to identify a prior art suggestion to combine Lang with Pirolli, but has rather simply made conclusory statements. As best understood, what the Office Action is saying is that once Lang is modified (in some unsupported way) to use the ranking system of Pirolli to determine which documents should be viewed first."

In addition to the fact that Pirolli does not disclose the missing elements, and that there is insufficient ground for combining Lang and Pirolli, the ground stated by the Examiner is too broad and encompassing to form a proper specific rejection ground as legally required. The fact that the use of a ranking system could help the user determine which documents to view first is a general truism that does not bear relevance to the specific invention, as claimed.

To conclude, independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are allowable over Lang and Pirolli, whether considered separately or in combination with each other. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

G. Claims 2, 10, and 18

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 10, and 18 based on the ground that “Lang further discloses including a search results transformer that converts the ranked matches to a user browsable form, (col. 23, lines 39-65).”

Applicant submits that claims 2, 10, and 18 are allowable for depending on the allowable claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively.

H. Claims 3, 11, and 19

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 11, and 19, based on the ground that “Lang further discloses including an indexing engine that indexes web documents to generate indexed data, (col. 12, lines 21-38 and col. 24, lines 49-col. 25, lines 5).”

Applicant submits that claims 3, 11, and 19 are allowable for depending on the allowable claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively.

I. Claims 4, 12, and 20

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 12, and 20, based on the ground that “Lang further discloses including a metadata repository for storing web documents that have been downloaded on-line, (col. 1, lines 10-34).”

Applicant submits that claims 4, 12, and 20 are allowable for depending on the allowable claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively.

J. Claims 5, 13, and 21

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 13, and 21, based on the ground that “Lang further discloses including a query transformer which, when prompted by a query, applies a query request to the indexed data and generates the query results, (col. 23, lines 54 - col. 25, lines 5).”

Applicant submits that claims 5, 13, and 21 are allowable for depending on the allowable claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively.

K. Claims 6, 14, and 22

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 14, and 22, based on the ground that “Lang further discloses wherein the any of the users’ on-line surveys or feedback include annotations, (col. 23, lines 54 - col. 25, lines 5).”

Applicant submits that claims 6, 14, and 22 are allowable for depending on the allowable claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively. In addition, to the best of Applicant’s understanding of Lang, the cited text does not disclose the use of annotations.

L. Claims 7, 15, and 23

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 15, and 23, based on the ground that “Lang further disclose wherein the any of the users’ on-line survey or feedback include any one or more of a questionnaire, a survey, or a web based rating service, (col. 7, lines 47 - 63).”

Applicant submits that claims 7, 15, and 23 are allowable for depending on the allowable claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively. In addition, to the best of Applicant’s

understanding of Lang, the cited text does not disclose the use of any one or more of a questionnaire, a survey, or a web based rating service.

M. Claims 8, 16, and 24

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 16, and 24, based on the ground that "Lang further discloses wherein the interactive criteria assess the quality of a business in terms of any one or more of: customer satisfaction, professionalism, cost, and ease of use of a product or service, (col. 4, lines 3-29 and col. 5, lines 51- col. 6, lines 4)."

Applicant submits that claims 8, 16, and 24 are allowable for depending on the allowable claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively.

CONCLUSION

All the claims presently on file in the present application are in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If it is felt for any reason that direct communication would serve to advance prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: January 27, 2003

Samuel A. Kassatly Law Office
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA 95120
Tel: (408) 323-5111
Fax: (408) 323-5112

Samuel A. Kassatly
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 32,247
Tel. (408) 323-5111